IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

Notice of Motion No. 341 of 2004
in
WRIT PETITION NO.3050 OF 2003

Rashtrawadi Suraksha Rakshah Aghadi ... Petitioner

Versus

The Security Guards Board for Greater Bombay and Thane District and Ors. ...Respondents.

Mr.Susheel Mahadeshwar for the petitioner in support.
Mrs. Lata Desai for respondent no.1.
Mr. V.C. Kotwal with Ms. Neeta Rajda instructed by DSR Associates for respondent No.2.
Mr. A.Y. Sakhare instructed by Ajay Mishra for respondent no.3.

With
Notice of Motion No. 182 of 2004
in
Writ Petition No. 3050 of 2003

Rashtrawadi Suraksha Rakshah Aghadi ... Petitioner

Versus

The Security Guards Board for Greater Bombay and Thane District and Ors. ...Respondents.

Mr. V.C. Kotwal with Ms. Neeta Rajda instructed by DSR Associates for respondent No.2 in support.
Mr.Susheel Mahadeshwar for the petitioner.
Mrs. Lata Desai for respondent no.1.
Mr. A.Y. Sakhare instructed by Ajay Mishra for respondent no.3.

CORAM: **DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J.** &
DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD, J.

DATE: **AUGUST 27, 2004**.

P.C.

We propose to dispose of both the Notices of Motion by this common order.

2. Mr. V.C. Kotwal, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent no.2, submits that he required only 16 security guards. Instead of 16 security guards, presently 32 security guards have been sent at his premises. Mr. Kotwal, on instructions, submits that presently he has no requirement of any security guards. In case respondent no.2 requires security guards, they would employ them privately on permanent basis.

3. The learned counsel appearing for respondent no.3 submits that since the security guards are not required by respondent No.2, he would remove the other 16 guards who are not shown in Annexure-A.

4. The learned counsel for respondent No. 2 also submitted that there is no requirement of security guards. Learned counsel appearing for security guards enumerated in Annexure-A undertakes to remove 16 security guards named in Annexure-A immediately after the entire outstanding amount is deposited by respondent No.2.

5. Mr. Kotwal, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, undertakes to deposit the outstanding wages of the security guards for the period from December, 2003 to 28th August, 2004 of the security guards whose names are shown in Exhibit-A with the Prothonotary and Senior Master, within one week from today.

6. We direct the Board to register the security guards whose names have been shown in Annexure-A. The Board would endeavour to provide them the work subject to availability.

7. Prothonotary and Senior Master is directed to disburse the amount so deposited by respondent No.2 after identification of those security guards by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

8. Both the Notices of Motion are accordingly disposed of.

8. The parties to act on an ordinary copy of this order duly authenticated by the office of this Court.

CHIEF JUSTICE

DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD, J.